DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 045 PS 026 021

AUTHOR	Brown, Brett V.
TITLE	The Single Father Family: Recent Trends in Demographic, Economic, and Public Transfer Use Characteristics.
INSTITUTION	Child Trends, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, MD. Early Child Care Network.
PUB DATE	1996-10-11
NOTE	24p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Father's Involvement (Bethesda, MD, October 11, 1996).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Analysis; Demography; Economic Factors; Educational Attainment; Employment; Family Characteristics; Family Structure; *Fathers; *One Parent Family; Socioeconomic Background; Socioeconomic Status; Spouses; Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	Aid to Families with Dependent Children; Earned Income Tax Credit; Food Stamp Program; Medicaid

ABSTRACT

This conference presentation explores current patterns of public transfer receipt (such as earned income tax credit, public health insurance coverage, food stamps, and public assistance) among single-father families and provides an update on existing census-based research on characteristics of single-father families. Data were obtained from the March Current Population Surveys (CPS) for selected years from 1983 through 1995. Demographic characteristics, socioeconomic characteristics, and public transfer receipts were compared for three types of fathers: (1) married fathers; (2) single fathers living with a partner; and (3) single fathers living without a partner. Findings indicated that the number of single-father families increased substantially between 1984 and 1994, and by 1995, accounted for 5.9 percent of all fathers living with their own children. "Cohabiting" fathers were considerably younger than married or "non-cohabiting" single fathers. Single fathers were more likely to be black, had less education and significantly lower incomes than married fathers. Only six percent of non-cohabiting single fathers received child support payments. Rates of health insurance coverage for single fathers was substantially lower than that experienced by single-mother families. Single fathers were less likely to work full time than married fathers. Single-father families depended much more than married-father families on public transfers. Fathers' income increased in the late 1980s and decreased in the 1990s. The rates of receipt for most forms of public transfers declined or stayed constant between 1984 and 1989 and increased between 1989 and 1994. (KB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 414 045

The Single Father Family: Recent Trends in Demographic, Economic, and Public Transfer Use Characteristics.

by

Brett V. Brown, Ph.D.
Research Associate
Child Trends, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Felisha
Hawkins
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

To be delivered at the *Conference on Father's Involvement*, Bethesda, MD at the Natcher Conference Center. October 11, 1996.

Funding for this paper was provided by the NICHD Child and Family Research Network.

PS 026021

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For the past several decades there has been a substantial and continuous increase in families headed by single fathers, both absolutely and as a percentage of all families with children (Garasky and Meyer, 1996; Eggebeen, Snyder, and Manning, 1996; Bianchi, 1995; McLanahan and Casper, 1995; Meyer and Garasky, 1993). Until very recently little was known about these families. Though they still comprise a relatively small proportion of all families with children,[1] their continued growth has sparked several recent efforts using decennial census data to describe more systematically the characteristics of these families, and to identify the forces accounting for their increase (Eggebeen, Snyder, and Manning, 1996; Garasky and Meyer, 1996).

This paper extends this recent research in two important ways. First, it explores in some depth current patterns of public transfer receipt by single father families. Such information is much needed in an era of dramatic changes in the nation's social safety net, changes which have taken place in ignorance of the likely consequences for such families. Second, it provides a five-year update on existing census-based research on a broad range of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics for single father families. This is also important, as existing research has demonstrated important changes in their composition in each of the last several decades (Eggebeen, Snyder, and Manning, 1996; Garasky and Meyer, 1996).

Estimates on selected characteristics of father-only families have long been regularly published by the Bureau of the Census as part of its regular data series. In general, they have been published in tables that also included estimates for two-parent and single-mother families, and received little individual attention. In addition, interpretation of these estimates is problematic because they include single fathers who are actually cohabiting with the mother of their children. Data from these series have been culled and presented as time trends in several published articles and a book (Bianchi, 1995; Meyer and Garasky, 1993; Hernandez, 1993).

In response to criticism that these data overestimate the growth of single father families by including the fast growing category of cohabiting parents (Bumpass and Raley, 1995), Garasky and Meyer used decennial census data to decompose the growth of such families by looking separately and cohabiting and non-cohabiting single fathers (Garasky and Meyer, 1996). Their results indicated that cohabiting fathers accounted for about one half of the observed growth in single father families over the last several decades.

Eggebeen, Snyder, and Manning (1996) use 1990 census data to examine the characteristics of the single father families from the perspective of the child. These child-based analyses systematically compare demographic and socioeconomic characteristics for children in nine distinct single-father family types defined by marital status (divorced, widowed, and never married) and, within marital status, by living arrangements (cohabiting, lone father, and complex

---

[1] Between three and five percent of all families with own children, depending on the definition of single father family used (Garasky and Meyer, 1996).

household).[2] Characteristics examined included father's education and employment patterns, poverty status and income, and adult-to-child ratios.

Data and Methods

The data for these analyses come from the March Current Population Surveys for selected years from 1983 through 1995.[3] The unit of analysis is fathers who are living with their own child or children under age 18. Three types of fathers are systematically compared: married fathers; single fathers living with a partner; and single fathers living without a partner (though they may have been living with other adults).

Beginning in 1995, the March CPS allows one to distinguish between opposite sex house mates and unmarried partners in most cases, something which is not possible for previous years.[4] For this reason, data for 1995 are presented separately from the time trend data to take full advantage of this greater precision in identifying cohabiting fathers. In the time trend analyses, cohabiting fathers of necessity include those living with partners and some who are living with house mates. The inclusion of those living with house mates is minimized by including only those who are opposite sex, unmarried, age 15 or older, and within ten years of age of the father.[5]

In order to assure a large enough sample size for cohabiting single fathers (who were still quite rare in the early 1980s) I combined two years of data for each of the three time periods presented in the time trend analyses. Because the March CPS has overlapping samples in adjacent years, data from non-adjacent years were combined.[6]

Three domains of measures are explored: demographic characteristics, socioeconomic characteristics, and public transfer receipt. I begin by presenting data from the March 1995 CPS

---

[2] "Cohabiting" consists of those living with an acknowledged unmarried partner; "lone father" consists of fathers living only with their children; and "complex households" consist of the father, his children, and other related or unrelated adults except for partners.

[3] In 1983 the CPS improved its methodology for identifying subfamilies. There was concern that this change may have affected the identification of single father families to an extent that makes time trend comparisons of pre- and post- 1983 data problematic. For this reason the decision was made to restrict these analyses to data from 1983 forward.

[4] In all cases where the single father or his partner is head of household, partner status can be unambiguously identified. This was the case for over 85% of all single fathers.

[5] This may somewhat overstate cohabitants as a component of total growth owing to the limitations of the definition of "cohabiting" adopted for the trend analyses.

[6] Estimates labeled 1984, 1989, and 1994 were produced be combining data from 1983 and 1985, 1988 and 1990, and 1993 and 1995, respectively.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in all three areas, comparing married fathers to cohabiting and non-cohabiting single fathers. These analyses are then repeated, to the extent that the data will permit, for 1984, 1989, and 1994.

Characteristics of Contemporary Single Father-Families

Demographic Characteristics

Table 1 presents demographic characteristics of fathers and their families and households for 1995.

Distribution Across Father Types. Single fathers accounted for 5.9 percent of all fathers living with their own children in 1995. Two-thirds of these were non-cohabiting single fathers, and one third cohabiting.

Age and Race/ethnicity Group of Father. Cohabiting fathers, with a mean age of 31, are considerably younger than either married or non-cohabiting single fathers, who both average 38 years of age. Single fathers are more likely to be black than married fathers, with blacks comprising 25% of all cohabiting fathers, 19 percent of non-cohabiting fathers, and only 8 percent of married fathers. Representation of white non-Hispanic fathers increases correspondingly (from 59 to 65 and 77 percent across the three categories) while Hispanics are fairly consistently represented with percentages ranging from 11 to 14 percent. In other analyses, not shown, nearly 14 percent of all black fathers living with their own children were single fathers of one type or the other, more than twice the overall rate of 6 percent.

Marital Status. By examining the marital status of cohabiting and non-cohabiting single fathers, we can shed light on the paths leading to these family arrangements. In 1995 nearly one in five non-cohabiting fathers had never been married, indicating a willingness of a significant number of never-married fathers to take primary parental responsibility for their own children. In addition, more than one in three cohabiting fathers were separated, divorced, or widowed. This implies that a substantial proportion of single fathers bring their children into cohabiting relationships, and that cohabiting fathers are not exclusively those living with the mother of their children.[7]

Headship and Family Structure. Most single fathers are head of their own household. However, thirteen percent of all non-cohabiting single fathers live in households headed by their parents or another relative. This arrangement is less common among cohabiting fathers (at six percent), and only one percent of married fathers live in such arrangements. Nearly one in five (nineteen percent) non-cohabiting fathers lives with adult relatives other than their adult children.

---

[7] From these data it is not possible to tell what proportion of divorced fathers actually brought children into the cohabiting relationship.

Such living arrangements may serve to enhance the material well-being of the father's family, and may offer opportunities to share child care and supervision duties. Recent research by Eggebeen et al indicates that non-cohabiting single fathers who are living in such complex households are considerably less educated and have lower earnings than those who live only with their children (Eggebeen, Snyder, and Manning, 1996).

Child Characteristics. Where the majority (63 percent) of married fathers live with two or more of their own children, most single fathers live with only one; 61 percent for non-cohabiting fathers, and 66 percent for cohabiting fathers. The children of cohabiting fathers are more likely to be infants or young toddlers, however: 37 percent of such fathers have a child under age two, compared to only 11 percent among non-cohabiting fathers, and 20 percent among married fathers. These characteristics imply substantially different child care needs across the three groups.

Socioeconomic Characteristics

Education and Income. Single fathers of either type are less educated and have much lower incomes than married fathers. (See Table 2) Married fathers earn at least $10,000 per year more than single fathers on average, have household incomes averaging more than $16,000 higher, and are less than one half as likely to be poor. Comparisons between the two single father types are more complex. Cohabiting fathers are less educated than non-cohabiting fathers (with 30 percent receiving less than 12 years of education compared to 18 percent among non-cohabiting single fathers), are more likely to be poor (20 percent versus 27 percent) and have lower mean family incomes ($21,894 versus $28,104). On the other hand, they have very similar mean household incomes ($35,537 versus $36,162). Most of the income gap was closed by the unmarried partner of cohabiting fathers, who added, on average, over $10,000 in income to the household total. While this still leaves the households of cohabiting fathers with less income per person ($8461 versus $10,636) it does substantially close the income gap between the two family types.

Child Support Receipt. Only six percent of all non-cohabiting single fathers reported receiving any child support payments in 1994. Rates of receipt among married and cohabiting fathers was one percent.

Health Insurance Coverage. Rates of health insurance coverage for the youngest child were highest among married fathers at 88 percent, followed by non-cohabiting single fathers at 79 percent and cohabiting single fathers at 70 percent. These rates are substantially lower than those experienced by single mother families, even though the latter are considerably worse off economically.[8] Coverage for the fathers themselves exhibited a similar pattern, except that rates of coverage were considerably lower for cohabiting fathers at 61 percent.

---

[8] In 1993, 14 percent of children in mother only families were not covered by health insurance, compared to 22 percent of children in single father families (Brown and Stagner, 1996).

Employment. Single fathers are less likely to work full-time/full-year than married fathers, and less likely to be working long hours. Among married fathers, 33 percent worked 45 or more hours during the previous week compared to 21 percent and 15 percent of non-cohabiting and cohabiting single fathers, respectively. In addition, single fathers were substantially more likely than married fathers to report not working at all (13 percent and 9 percent for non-cohabiting and cohabiting single fathers, versus 5 percent for married fathers).

These patterns undoubtedly reflect age and education-related differences in employment patterns, but may also reflect additional time spent in parenting activities by single fathers. The fact that one in eight non-cohabiting single fathers did not work at all during the previous year is particularly striking, suggesting the possibility that some fathers are adopting a full-time caretaker role for their children.

Public Transfer Receipt

An issue of substantial importance to contemporary policy is the extent to which single father families depend on public transfers for their material well-being, and the types of transfers on which they depend. Table 3 presents rates of receipt for the earned income tax credit (EITC), food stamps, public health insurance, public assistance (AFDC and general assistance), and free or reduced price lunch. Average annual dollar amounts received among recipients are also presented for the EITC, food stamps, and public assistance. The data indicate that a large percentage of single father families depend to some extent on public transfers, far in excess of married father families.

Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). While 15 percent of married fathers receive EITC funds, 43 percent of non-cohabiting and 61 percent of cohabiting single fathers receive EITC monies. The average amount received among recipients ranged from $1,229 to $1,368 across the three father types, making this both a common and a significant source of support for single fathers and their families.

Free or Reduced Price Lunch. Single fathers were twice as likely as married fathers to have children in the household receiving a free or reduced price lunch at school, with receipt rates of 28 and 30 percent for the single father groups versus 15 percent for married fathers.

Public Health Insurance Coverage. The next most common form of public transfer receipt among single fathers came in the form of Medicare/Medicaid coverage for their children. One in five non-cohabiting fathers had a youngest child covered by Medicaid or Medicare, as did one in three cohabiting fathers. This compares to a rate of 12 percent for married fathers, a much smaller though still substantial rate of coverage. Single fathers were also more likely to be dependent on Medicaid for their own health coverage, with coverage rates of 5 percent for married fathers versus 11 percent and 14 percent for non-cohabiting and cohabiting single fathers, respectively.

Food Stamps. Cohabiting single fathers had the highest rate of household food stamp receipt at 27 percent, followed by non-cohabiting single fathers at 17 percent, and married fathers

at seven percent. Among recipient households, the average cash value of food stamps received during the previous year was about $2000, again, a substantial level of support.

Public Assistance (AFDC or General Assistance). Rates of public assistance receipt claimed by the fathers themselves is modest across all three father groups, with a high of seven percent among non-cohabiting single fathers, and four percent among both married and cohabiting fathers. However, when public assistance receipt claimed by the unmarried partner is included, rates of receipt for cohabiting father families jumps to 22 percent. Among those who do receive, the annual average level of support is quite substantial at over $4000.

The Changing Characteristics of Single-Father Families

Tables 4 through 6 present trend data on the characteristics of single and married father families for three time periods: 1984, 1989, and 1994. These are similar to the first three tables, but differ in one important respect. The operational definitions of "cohabiting" and "non-cohabiting" single fathers are somewhat different. Prior to 1995, one could not distinguish between unmarried partners and house mates. For these analyses, any women who is identified as a partner/housemate , and who is age 15 or older, unmarried, and within 10 years of the age of the father is assumed to be a cohabitant of the father.[9]

Changes in Demographic Characteristics

The total number of single-father families increased by 370,000 between 1984 and 1989, and by an additional 300,000 between 1989 and 1994 to 1.56 million. (See Table 4) Single father families as percent of all families containing fathers increased steadily from 3.6 percent to 4.8 percent to 5.8 percent over those time periods. Cohabiting fathers accounted for about 60 percent of this increase in both periods.

The proportion of cohabiting single fathers who were never married increased substantially between 1989 and 1994, from 49 percent to 63 percent. Never-married fathers accounted for 89 percent of the total growth in cohabiting fathers between 1989 and 1994.

Changes in Socioeconomic Characteristics

Between 1984 and 1989, income measures increased and poverty decreased across all three groups of fathers. (See Table 9) Household incomes increased 17 percent among married father families, and by a more modest 11 and 12 percent for non-cohabiting and cohabiting single

---

[9] This is essentially the same technique used by Garasky and Meyer (1996) for their trend analyses of decennial census data. Analyses using 1995 CPS data revealed that about two-thirds of the fathers identified in this way were in fact cohabiting; the remainder were living with female house mates. A comparison of single father characteristics using the alternative definitions using data from the March 1995 CPS indicates that this mis-identification results in slightly higher socioeconomic characteristics for cohabiting fathers, and modestly lower characteristics for non-cohabiting fathers.

father families. Between 1989 and 1994, income dropped for all three groups, though the drop was far larger for both non-cohabiting and cohabiting single fathers than for married fathers. For example, household income for married fathers dropped by less than two percent (from $53,927 to $53,008), while non-cohabiting single fathers experienced a 9.5 percent decrease, and cohabiting fathers an 18 percent decrease. The evidence would seem to indicate that there has been an economic pulling away of married father families from both types of single father families during the previous decade.

Changes in Public Transfer Receipt

Between 1984 and 1989, rates of receipt for most forms of public transfers declined somewhat or stayed constant for all three types of fathers. The major exception is in Medicaid/Medicare coverage for children, which increased somewhat for all father groups. Between 1989 and 1994 levels of receipt increased for all public transfer programs and for all three father groups. Non-cohabiting father families experienced substantially increased rates of receipt in two programs; child receipt of Medicare or Medicaid (from 10 percent to 17 percent), and receipt of free or reduced prices lunch (from 16 percent to 26 percent). Increases in 1994 for this group were modest in the remaining programs, particularly when compared to 1984 rates.

Cohabiting single fathers experienced substantial increases in rates of public transfer receipt across the board. Household food stamp receipt increased from 19 percent to 29 percent; the proportion of youngest children receiving Medicare of Medicaid jumped from 19 percent to 31 percent; household public assistance receipt increased from 18 to 24 percent; and receipt of free or reduce-priced lunches increased from 18 percent to 25 percent. The rapid increase in never-married fathers as a proportion of all cohabiting fathers during this period is undoubtedly related to this rise in dependency on public transfers.

Discussion and Conclusion

This paper has highlighted several features of single father families which have important implications for social policy and for future research. First and foremost, it is clear that a substantial proportion of both non-cohabiting and cohabiting single father families depend on public transfers to enhance their well-being. Receipt of EITC funds is most wide spread, affecting 43 percent of cohabiting and 61 percent of non-cohabiting single father families in 1994. Food stamps and public health insurance are received by approximately one in five non-cohabiting single father families, and an even larger percentage of cohabiting father families. Finally, rates of public assistance receipt are relatively modest among non-cohabiting single-father families at seven percent, but play a much larger role in cohabiting father families where 22 percent receive public assistance, and where the average annual amount received exceeds $4000.

Unlike single-mother families, the recent and dramatic changes in the AFDC program will not have a large impact on non-cohabiting single father families as a group. Planned

reductions in the food stamp program will likely have a significant negative impact on these families. Such families would be far more negatively affected by the reductions in the EITC, Medicare, and Medicaid programs that were being contemplated during the previous Congress. The families of cohabiting single fathers are even more vulnerable to reductions in these programs due their higher rates of receipt across the board, particularly where AFDC support is concerned.

In general, the families of married fathers seem to be pulling away economically from both types of single father families. The reasons for this are unclear. Some possibilities include increasing returns to higher education, greater earnings on the part of spouses, and restricted career development of single fathers due to greater demands on their time for parenting.

The findings regarding living arrangements and employment patterns are suggestive of strategies that single fathers may be adopting regarding parenting and child care arrangements. Of particular interest are the one in eight non-cohabiting single fathers in 1995 who had not worked at all during the previous year. It may be that many of these fathers have opted to become full-time caretakers for their children. Fathers who are awarded custody of their children may in part be awarded custody because of a willingness or desire to perform such a role. Alternatively, it may be that single fathers who do not have good employment prospects have opted for the caretaker role, perhaps within the context of an extended household. Further research should be done to explore some of these possibilities.

One of the limitations of both the decennial census and CPS data that have been used to study single father families is the inability to distinguish between those fathers who bring children into cohabiting relationships, and those who are cohabiting with the biological mothers of their children. The former share more in common conceptually with non-cohabiting single fathers in that they have primary responsibility for the children. If the adult relationship should end, the children will most likely go with the father, which is not the case where cohabiting biological parents are concerned. Analyses which make this distinction are possible with the Survey of Income and Program Participation, and are currently being designed as an extension to the work presenter here.

REFERENCES

Brown, B. And M. Stagner (eds.) (1996). Trends in the Well-being of America's Children and Youth: 1996. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Bianchi, , S.M. 1995. "The Changing Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics of Single Parent Families." *Marriage and Family Review* 20: 71-97.

Eggebeen, D.J., A.R. Snyder, and W.D. Manning. 1996. "Children in Single Father Families in Demographic Perspective." *Journal of Family Issues* 17:441-465.

Garasky, S, and D.R. Meyer. 1996. "Reconsidering the Increase in Father-Only Families." *Demography* 33: 385-393.

Hernandez, D.J. (1993). *America's Children: Resources from Families, the Government, and the Economy*. New York: Russell Sage.

McLanahan, S. and L. Casper. 1995. "Growing Diversity and Inequality in the American Family." Pp. 1-45 in *State of the Union: America in the 1990s. Vol. 2: Social Trends*, edited by R. Farley, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Meyer, D.R. and S. Garasky. 1993. Custodial Fathers: Myths, Realities, and Child Support Policy. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55:73-89.

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MARRIED AND SINGLE FATHERS RESIDING WITH OWN CHILDREN: 1995

	Married	Single	
		Not cohabiting	Cohabiting[1]
Father Characteristics			
Total (%)	94.1%	3.9%	2.0%
Age of Father (mean)	38	38	31
Race/ethnicity (%)			
white non-Hispanic	77%	65%	58%
black non-Hispanic	8%	18%	25%
Hispanic	11%	14%	13%
other	4%	3%	4%
	100%	100%	100%
Marital Status (%)			
widowed	--	8%	1%
separated or divorced	--	71%	36%
never married	--	22%	63%
		100%	100%
Relation to Household Head (%)			
head or spouse	98%	85%	86%
child	0%	10%	5%
other relative	1%	3%	1%
unmarried partner	0%	0%	6%
other	0%	2%	3%
	100%	100%	100%
Household and Family Characteristics			
Other Relatives in Household (%)			
Any Adult Relative[2]	5%	19%	7%
Parent	1%	13%	5%
Mean Number of Persons in Household	4.2	3.4	4.1
Families with only 1 child (%)	37%	61%	66%
Families with Children < age 2 (%)	20%	11%	34%
Sample Size	15,102	715	206

[1]Includes unmarried partners, does not include house mates.

[2]Does not include spouse or adult children.

TABLE 2
SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MARRIED AND SINGLE FATHERS RESIDING WITH OWN CHILDREN: 1995

	Married	Single Not Cohabiting	Cohabiting[1]
Educational Attainment			
< 12 years (%)	12%	18%	30%
12 years (%)	32%	42%	51%
> 12 years (%)	56%	41%	20%
	100%	100%	100%
Income and Related Measures			
Poverty (%)	9%	20%	27%
Father's Earnings (mean 1994 $$)	$34,716	$23,504	$20,593
Total Income (mean 1994 $$)			
family	$53,170	$28,104	$21,894
family - partner	$53,170	$28,104	$32,392
household	$53,710	$36,162	$35,537
Child Support Receipt (%)	1%	6%	1%
Health Insurance Coverage			
Youngest Child (% covered)	88%	79%	70%
Father (% covered)	87%	76%	61%
Employment			
Full-Time Full-Year Worker (%)	80%	63%	59%
Non-worker (%)	5%	13%	9%
Worked 45+ hours in previous week (%)	33%	21%	15%
Sample Size	15,102	715	206

[1]Includes unmarried partners, does not include house mates.

TABLE 3
PUBLIC TRANSFER RECEIPT AMONG MARRIED AND SINGLE FATHERS RESIDING WITH OWN CHILDREN: 1995

	Married	Single Not Cohabiting	Cohabiting[4]
Percent Receiving Public Transfers			
Earned Income Tax Credit (father)	15%	43%	61%
Free or reduced price lunch (household)	15%	28%	30%
Public Health Insurance Coverage youngest child (Medicaid Medicare)	12%	20%	32%
father (Medicaid)	5%	11%	14%
Food Stamps (household)	7%	17%	27%
Public Assistance			
family	4%	7%	4%
family + partner	4%	7%	22%
Average Annual Amount Received Among Recipients			
Food Stamps (household, 1994 $$)	$1,922	$2,044	$1,930
Public Assistance (household, 1994 $$)	$4,438	$4,071	$4,465
Earned Income Tax Credit (father, 1994 $$)	$1,229	$1,323	$1,368
Sample Size	15,102	715	206

[4]Includes unmarried partners, does not include house mates.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MARRIED AND SINGLE FATHERS RESIDING WITH OWN CHILDREN: 1984-1994

	Married			Single					
				Not Cohabiting			Cohabiting[5]		
Father Characteristics	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994
Total									
number (millions)	24.29	24.97	25.45	0.77	0.92	1.04	0.12	0.34	0.52
As a percent of all fathers living with own child	96.5%	95.2%	94.2%	3.1%	3.5%	3.9%	0.5%	1.3%	1.9%
Age of Father (mean)	38	38	38	39	39	39	30	31	31
Race/ethnicity (%)									
white non-Hispanic	82%	79%	78%	75%	74%	69%	71%	66%	64%
black non-Hispanic	8%	8%	8%	16%	16%	18%	19%	17%	17%
Hispanic	8%	9%	11%	8%	8%	11%	7%	14%	17%
other	3%	4%	4%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Marital Status (%)									
widowed	--	--	--	11%	10%	8%	2%	1%	1%
separated of divorced	--	--	--	77%	75%	75%	50%	50%	36%
never married	--	--	--	12%	15%	17%	48%	49%	63%
				100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Relation to Household Head (%)									
head or spouse	98%	98%	98%	84%	86%	84%	92%	90%	88%
child	1%	1%	0%	13%	11%	12%	5%	2%	3%
other relative	1%	1%	1%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%	1%
nonrelative	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	8%	9%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

[5]Includes housemates as well as unmarried partners.

TABLE 4 (continued)
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MARRIED AND SINGLE FATHERS: 1984-1994

	Married			Single					
				Not Cohabiting			Cohabiting		
Household and Family Characteristics	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994
Other relatives in household (%) any adult relative[6]	5%	5%	5%	21%	26%	22%	9%	5%	7%
Mean Number of persons in household	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.8	4.0	4.1
Families with only 1 child (%)	39%	39%	37%	64%	60%	61%	74%	72%	64%
Families with children < age 2 (%)	21%	21%	20%	4%	9%	7%	22%	35%	36%
Sample Size	35,058	32,908	30,887	1105	1175	1249	177	443	639

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[6]Does not include spouse.

TABLE 5
SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MARRIED AND SINGLE FATHERS: 1984-1994

	Married			Single					
				Not Cohabiting			Cohabiting[7]		
	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994
Educational Attainment									
< 12 years	17%	14%	12%	25%	19%	17%	31%	28%	27%
12 years	37%	36%	34%	35%	40%	39%	42%	44%	51%
> 12 years	46%	49%	54%	39%	41%	43%	27%	29%	22%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Income and Related Measures (previous year)									
Poverty (%)	10%	8%	9%	20%	15%	17%	32%	22%	31%
Father's Earnings (mean $$)	$35,058	$36,418	$34,398	$25,779	$28,126	$25,099	$20,381	$23,421	$18,936
Total Income (mean $$)									
family	$45,558	$53,273	$52,414	$31,071	$35,041	$30,386	$22,855	$26,064	$20,504
family + partner	$45,558	$53,273	$52,414	$31,071	$35,041	$30,386	$33,176	$38,699	$31,129
household	$46,077	$53,927	$53,008	$37,008	$41,132	$37,235	$36,692	$40,958	$33,406
Child Support/Alimony Receipt (%)	0%	0%	0%	3%	4%	6%	0%	1%	1%
Health Insurance Coverage									
Youngest Child (% covered)	--	89%	89%	--	78%	80%	--	73%	73%

[7]Includes housemates as well as unmarried partners.

TABLE 5 (continued)
SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MARRIED AND SINGLE FATHERS: 1984-1994

	Married			Single					
				Not Cohabiting			Cohabiting		
	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994
Father (% covered)	90%	89%	87%	79%	77%	77%	70%	65%	59%
Employment									
Full-Time/Full-Year Worker (%)	73%	79%	79%	59%	65%	64%	51%	64%	57%
Non-worker (%)	5%	4%	5%	14%	11%	14%	10%	5%	9%
Sample Size	35,058	32,908	30,887	1105	1175	1249	177	443	639

TABLE 6
PUBLIC TRANSFER RECEIPT AMONG MARRIED AND SINGLE FATHERS: 1984-1994

	Married			Single					
				Not Cohabiting			Cohabiting*		
Percent Receiving Public Transfers	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994	1984	1989	1994
Free or reduced price lunch (household)	11%	10%	13%	18%	16%	26%	11%	18%	25%
Public Health Insurance Coverage									
youngest child (Medicaid/Medicare)	4%	5%	10%	8%	10%	17%	13%	19%	31%
father (Medicaid)	3%	3%	5%	9%	7%	11%	11%	6%	11%
Food Stamps (household) (previous year)	7%	5%	7%	12%	9%	14%	18%	19%	28%
Public Assistance (previous year)									
household	3%	3%	4%	10%	9%	10%	20%	18%	24%
family + partner	3%	3%	4%	6%	7%	8%	20%	18%	24%
Sample Size	35,058	32,908	30,887	1105	1175	1249	177	443	639

*Includes housemates as well as unmarried partners.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE